DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 394 CS 208 980

AUTHOR Bjork, Ulf Jonas
TITLE Excitement, Tinged with Jingoism: British Public Opinion and the Falklands in Four News Magazines.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (68th, Memphis, TN, August 3-6, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; *Foreign Countries; International Relations; *Media Research; *News Reporting; *Periodicals; *Press Opinion; *Public Opinion; War
IDENTIFIERS Argentina; Austria; Canada; Falkland Islands; *Great Britain; Thatcher (Margaret); West Germany

ABSTRACT

A study examined how four news magazines in North America and Western Europe covered British public reaction to the 1982 Falklands War. The news magazines--similar in format--represented four nations with varying degrees of closeness to Great Britain: the United States ("Time"), Canada ("Macleans"), West Germany ("Spiegel"), and Austria ("Profil"). "Time" has a conservative bias, while "Spiegel" is considered fairly radical in the opinion range of West German media. Both "Profil" and "Macleans" try to take "independent" or "liberal" stands. The results indicated that the North American magazines used polls to determine public opinion, while the European magazines relied on press comments. While polls undoubtedly were more representative of the public as a whole (the majority supported the war), they were less effective in showing why the public had taken a particular stand. British public opinion contrasted sharply with the view of the four news magazines. Only "Profil" attempted to show what the "new British pride" was founded upon. The outburst of "jingoism" (a term used by all four magazines) in Britain in the spring of 1982 needed to be explained to Europeans and North Americans accustomed to viewing war as undesirable and unpopular. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260394

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXCITEMENT, TINGED WITH JINGOISM: BRITISH PUBLIC OPINION AND THE FALKLANDS IN FOUR NEWS MAGAZINES

Ulf Jonas Bjork
School of Communications
University of Washington

Presented to the AEJMC Convention, International Division, Memphis, August 1985.

CS 208 980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ulf Jonas Bjork

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Public opinion is a vital element of democracy, and there is a great deal of concern with measuring and describing it. A crucial role in the expression of opinion has traditionally been assigned to the press. Most often this role is described as one of enlightening or informing the public, but the mass media are also seen as reflecting general opinion.[1] "The Journalist," wrote James Bryce in a classic work on public opinion, "must feel the pulse of the mass of average citiens."[2] According to Bryce, a newspaper editorial will not espouse a viewpoint that has no support among its readers for fear of losing them. Taking a less cynical view of the press than Bryce, other writers have made a case for editorials as indicators of public opinion by stressing that their purpose is to guide their readers.[3] In this view, the opinions of the newspapers may not yet be those of the public, but eventually they will be.

In addition, newspapers have long been concerned with making public opinion visible. American newspapers were involved in straw polls before elections as early as the 1820s,[4] and the rising importance of scientific polling has been accompanied by

increasing use of poll data by the media.[5] While polls more and more are seen as legitimate statements of public opinion, the press' connection with general opinion remains close.

Press portrayals of public opinion are the focus of this paper. Its primary goal is to analyze how four news magazines in North America and Western Europe covered the reaction of the British public to the 1982 Falklands War.

THE MAGAZINES

The four news magazines of his study were selected to represent four Western nations with varying ties of closeness to Great Britain: the United States, West Germany, Canada and Austria. With the first three, Britain shares membership in NATO. The United States and Canada have strong historical and cultural ties to the United Kingdom, with Canada being a member of the British Commonwealth. West Germany and Britain are both members of the European Community. Austria, finally, is a European neutral.

All four countries were involved, to some degree, in the Falklands conflict. The United States initially attempted to assume the role of a mediator but finally threw its support to Britain. West Germany supported Britain almost immediately after the Argentine invasion as the European Community banned imports from Argentina and several member countries stopped arms sales to the Argentines.[6] Austria, though not a community member, also joined the arms embargo. Canada went the furthest by recalling its ambassador for consultations following the Argentine invasion. Like Germany, Canada also stopped arms sales to and imports from Argentina.[7]

As to the magazines, Macleans was an obvious choice for Canada since it is that country's "national news magazine" with a weekly edition of 640,000. Der Spiegel and Time have competitors in their home countries and were chosen on account of their circulation. With 4.5 million copies every week, Time reaches more readers than the New York Times, for instance, and the 1 million weekly circulation of Spiegel makes it one of the largest news publications in Germany. Profil is not the largest news magazine in Austria, but its 72,000 circulation still makes it prominent; availability was the criterion here.[8]

The news magazine format entails more interpretation and commentary than is found in a typical American newspaper, and objectivity is thus less of a concern to the four magazines. Time has a conservative bias, while Spiegel is considered fairly radical in the opinion range of West German media. Both Profil and Maclean's try to take "independent" or "liberal" stands."[9] The four are similar in format, with Spiegel being directly modelled on Time. Maclean's and Profil are newsmagazines in the Time/Newsweek tradition.[10]

GENERAL COVERAGE

The four magazines considered the Falklands conflict a newsworthy event. Published on the same weekday, Time, Spiegel, and Maclean's ran articles about the war in all 12 issues between April 12 and June 28. Profil's coverage was slightly less extensive: the magazine had shifted its focus to domestic events in Argentina by June 21. Since magazines have early deadlines

compared to newspapers, the coverage lagged somewhat: Argentina's invasion on April 2 was not covered in the April 5 issue of any of the magazines, for instance, and the final Argentine surrender on June 14 was reported in the June 21 issues of Spiegel and Profil and the June 28 issue of Time and Maclean's.

A measurement of the war's prominence is that Time made the Falklands conflict its cover story in four of the issues, as did Spiegel and Maclean's.[11] In addition, the war twice shared Time covers with other events and appeared as the "ear" (the upper right hand corner of the cover) on another two.[12] Maclean's and Spiegel have no equivalents to the Time "ear," but their table of contents highlighted the Falklands in three and four issues, respectively, when the conflict was not on the cover.[13] Alone among the four, Profil did not consider the war worthy of cover stories. The Falklands conflict appeared as a higlights in its table of content three times, however.[14]

The open war aspect of the conflict doubtlessly added to its news value, although it was by no means the only armed conflict on the world scene in the spring of 1982. The Gulf War between Iran and Iraq saw alternating offensives and cease-fires in the April-June period, and in early June Israel invaded Lebanon.[15] The prominence of the Falklands may be explained by the involvement of an "elite nation," Great Britain, in the conflict.[16]

The continuing attention of the magazines is all the more notable as the conflict had long periods of inactivity, at least as far as military operations were concerned. More than three weeks elapsed between the Argentine invasion in early April and

the first fighting, the British seizure of South Georgia on April 25.[17] It was another week before the first heavy casualties, the sinking of the Argentine cruiser General Belgrano and the British destroyer HMS Sheffield in early May. The final British landing on the islands took place on May 21, after another two weeks.

PUBLIC OPINION IN BRITAIN

In sending a task force to retake the Falkland Islands the Thatcher government had the support of a clear majority of the British people. Looking back at the war in late July, the New Left Review was forced to admit that "the Falklands was not just Thatcher's war."[18]

Polls conducted throughout the war months showed rising satisfaction with how the government handled the conflict: in April, 60 percent were satisfied; in May, the figure was 70 percent; and in June it had risen to 84 percent.[19] The overwhelming approval baffled British observers: The Economist predicted in early May that the war's popularity would go down once the fighting started, but the magazine admitted in a post-war analysis in late June that the increase in support had been "the most extraordinary... for any government since Hitler's war."[20] When it came to concrete government actions, a mid-April poll showed 80 percent support for the naval blockade of the Falklands; 83 percent approved of sending the task force; and 67 percent favored landing British troops on the islands. When the last question was asked again in early May, support for a British landing was up to 72 percent.[21]

In April, 58 percent said they would accept higher taxes to regain British sovereignty over the Falklands; in June, the percentage willing to pay higher taxes to protect the islands was 71.[22] A minority, 44 percent, thought in April that British sovereignty would would be worth the loss of servicemen's lives.[23] After the fighting was over and 250 British soldiers, sailors and air force pilots had been killed, 74 percent thought that the task force still should have been sent.[24] Finally, an 81 percent majority said Britain had come out of the war more proud of herself.[25]

According to subsequent accounts of the Falklands war, public support also expressed itself in cheering crowds waving goodbye to the task force, in the willingness of dockyard workers to stay on the job around the clock to equip the fleet, and in the number of civilian seamen volunteering for duty in the South Atlantic. Letters to the editor were also more numerous during the war months, and most of these supported the war.[26]

Most of the British press came out in favor of the government, with The Sun, Britain's largest mass-circulation tabloid, going to extremes. After the war, fellow journalists accused the paper of sawying readers toward "mindless belligerence," pointing to, among other things, its invitation to readers to sponsor an Exocet missile bearing The Sun's name and its equating the war opposition of other paper with "treachery."[27] As a justification for its stand The Sun claimed to have the backing of public opinion, expressed in thousands of reader letters to the paper.[28] Discussing the image of war

presented by the tabloids, writer Patricia Holland reflects on the relationship between press and public in Britain during the Falklands conflict:

> [H]ow much do we know about public opinion apart from the media's own reports? The popular papers, indeed, construct 'public opinion' as one of the characters in this drama. It becomes a kind of affirmative Greek chorus, a crowd which occasionally troops onto stage to offer patriotic support to 'the nation' and 'our boys'...
>
> Thus actual public opinion is offered easy channels to flow along. Possible words for us to use, possible ways to link our ideas, come easily to mind. At the same time dissident opinions are either excluded or rendered contemptible.[29]

Dissident opinions were heard, however, even if they were not always popular. Among national papers, the Guardian and the Daily Mirror were skeptical, for instance.[30] Several other newspapers received reader letters complaining that the press was "too objective" in regard to the Argentines.[31] The BBC, which made a point of including both British and Argentine viewpoints in its coverage, was severely criticized for this by Conservative Members of Parliament and by Prime Minister Thatcher herself.[32]

As far as readership went, however, neither of the anti-war papers lost circulation during the conflict. Likewise, the BBC did not suffer from its supposedly "unpatriotic" coverage, as a late May poll showed that 65 percent considered TV coverage better than that of radio and newspapers.[33]

THE WAR AND THE VIEW OF THE MAGAZINES

The war was the first international armed conflict with a Western nation as a participant since the Vietnam War, and a great deal

of the international reaction was concerned with the danger and folly of armed conflict.[34] Adressing its non-British readers in mid-April, The Economist (which thought the fighting would be necessary) noted this reaction:

> A belief has crept into all of Europe's democracies... that you never fight -- not, at least, with guns and bombs and unpleasant things like that: those are for blimps, blusterers and television. Certainly, you do not fight about marginal issues. "Negotiate," that is the real answer; "give peace a chance."[35]

The four magazines of this study were all dismayed by the prospect of war although their concern varied. Spiegel and Profil were most consistently critical in their view of the war. The first Spiegel issue dealing with the conflict had a cover showing British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher as Joan of Arc, and the article itself presented the conflict as "an absurd war in a emote part of the world" and a "feud over a godforsaken archipelago of rocks."[36] It reported the outbreak of patriotism in Britain but concluded with a somewhat contradictory statement:

> As always in times of national emergency and threats from abroad [the British] keep calm.
>
> Masterfully and decently have they dissolved almost their entire glorious Empire, which at its height, with India, Canada and Australia, was 91 times larger than the mother country. They have fought no Indochinese or Algerian wars. Could they not let go of the last remainders of the Empire, 16 points on the globe, with equal decency?[37]

In the weeks to come, Spiegel went on to wonder how England, "homeland of the Enlightenment... has thrown herself head over heels into an absurd war adventure."[38]

The magazine was anti-war but not necessarily anti-British:

little sympathy was given to the "coarse fascists" of Argentina's "Latin American macho junta."[39] Spiegel's point was that the conflict was unnecessary: neither Britain nor Argentina needed the islands, according to the magazine; all that was at stake was pride.[40] The futility of war was driven home even in the moment of British triumph following the Argentine surrender. The June 21 issue opened by telling how a TV broadcast had shown wounded British soldiers aboard a hospital ship:

> The suffering of the soldiers passed through military censorship only after Britain had already won in the Falklands... Almost all the soldiers' faces... had large spots of flaking skin. The young men's hands, singed while the Sir Galahad went down in flames, were wrapped in antiseptic foil.[41]

Profil was as devastating in its criticism. The magazine considered the war "a barely comprehensible conflict over the question if a couple of hardly inhabitated islands in the South Atlantic should be called the Falklands or the Malvinas."[42] Stunned by the loss of lives when the British sank the General Belgrano, Profil's Buenos Aires correspondent wrote that "the weakly founded sovereignty claim of a colonial power in no way justifies jeopardizing human lives."[43] Britain's course of action was "morally reprehensible," the writer concluded.

This was not the view of the Vienna editors, however, who gave the article an "appendix" where readers were reminded that it was Argentina that first had sent soldiers to the islands. That this part of the conflict was virtually bloodless did not excuse it, claimed the appendix writer: Hitler's occupation of

Austria was bloodless, too.[44] Later coverage was less anti-British and more anti-war in tone: a third writer concluded a week later that both the Argentine dictatorship and the British democracy were "blood-stained."[45] Like Spiegel, Profil extended little sympathy to the Argentines: even the Buenos Aires man regarded the Argentine war enthusiasm as "sheer lunacy."[46]

All the conflict would result in, Profil thought, were unwanted side effects. By forcing the United States to take sides, Margaret Thatcher would accomplish more than Che Guevara and Castro together: "She will set the continent aflame," concluded one article, by uniting Latin America against the "damned Yankees."[47] The big winner would be the Soviet Union. Profil's June 21 issue abandoned coverage of the final days of fighting to discuss Latin American hostility towards the U.S.[48]

Time seemed more ambivalent in its attitude than the two German-language magazines. While declaring at an early stage that the conflict was "bizarre" and that "the waste and danger of war make it clear that the only logical solution is a negotiated settlement," the magazine nevertheless took President Reagan to task for not openly supporting the British.[49] Reagan's reaction was "tentative and halting," according to Time; the United States should find no difficulty choosing between "its oldest and staunchest ally" and "a country that was not only the aggressor but also had had a bloody history of human rights violations."[50] "Britain ought never to doubt where America's heart lies, especially in a crisis," Time concluded another article.[51]

As the actual fighting started, the uselessness of war began to dominate Time articles. Reporting the sinking of the Belgrano

and the Sheffield, the magazine used the headlines "Oh What an Ugly War" and "Two Hollow Victories at Sea."[52] The article began:

> Steadily, malignantly, the ugly stain of war spread over the leaden South Atlantic last week... For the first time, the military forces of Britain and Argentina had mauled each other on the high seas in the bizarre battle for possession of the remote, inhospitable Falkland Islands.[53]

Later on, Time referred to the war as "a tragedy,"[54] and stories more and more emphasized that American interests were at stake. "Will the U.S. Be the Loser?" asked the June 7 issue, and next week's Time concluded that this was already the case.[55]

Maclean's was the least condemning in its attitude toward armed conflict. The magazine characterized the initial stages of the war as "slightly silly," posing "Latin American machismo" versus "Gilbert and Sullivan chivalry."[56] However, Maclean's also reminded readers that while the world might look at the conflict with feeling ranging "from incredulity to hilarity," it was "deadly serious" to the Falklanders.[57] The magazine never had doubts about Britain's course of action if the Argentines would not yield, either, because "the aging Imperial Lion has suffered to many recent goads..."[58] Since neither side would back down, Maclean's looked at the subsequent course of events, from "a misplaced scene from The Pirates of Penzance to all-out war" as one that only "the darkest pessimist" would have predicted at the outset.[59]

Cost was the dominant theme of Maclean's coverage in the later stages of the conflict. Like Spiegel, the Canadian magazine considered the islands to be of little value:

> ...economically, strategically and politically, they are of little significance. But now, catalyzed by the raising of an Argentine flag on a barren rock, the drama is being played out over little more than a symbol.[60]

Like Time, Maclean's never directly criticized Britain. Its stance was almost exclusively against war in general: it "not only may kill appallingly, it costs outlandishly."[61] As the British captured Port Stanley and the fighting ended, the magazine remined readers that "the adventure still has to be paid for."[62]

While their concern varied, all four magazines concluded that the fighting served no real purpose, then. This opinion contrasted sharply with the mood in Britain at the time, however, and the final section of this study is devoted to the manner in which Time, Spiegel, Maclean's and Profil covered the public support of a war they considered unnecessary.

COVERING PUBLIC OPINION

Time relied almost exclusively on polls to show the British public mood: all but one of the seven issues dealing with British reaction cited poll figures.[63] While the questions asked by the pollsters dealt with concrete solutions to the crisis as well as public support for the government, Time stressed the latter aspect, noting "a mounting tide of support" for the Thatcher government.[64] Only the first two issues dealing with British polls mentioned public reaction

to concrete measures.[65] Time provided perspective by routinely comparing the newest figures to earlier polls, but the magazine confused matters somewhat by changing the scope of what the public supported.[66] The early issues gave the figures for public approval of the government's handling of the crisis (going from 60 to 85 percent during the war months), while later issues cited the percentage in favor of government policy overall.[67] Since some supporters of the war differed with the prime minister on domestic issues, the latter figures were lower, around 50 percent.

Maclean's made as thorough use of British polls as Time, citing poll figures in all but one of its issues dealing with public reaction in Britain.[68] The Canadian magazine provided less perspective, however: only two of its articles pointed to any change in public approval over time.[69] The steadily rising public support was thus not shown. On the other hand, Maclean's used a wider range of poll data, reporting not only the figures for public support for the government but the response to solutions as well.[70]

Spiegel used polls inconsistently and sparsely. Only four of its issues mentioned polls, and the data dealt with such different topics as support for concrete measures, approval of Thatcher's leadership, and President Reagan's popularity in Britain.[71] There were no comparisons between new and earlier figures. Profil, finally, used no British polls at all. As will be shown in the following, the two German-language magazines used other means to portray British

public opinion.

While using polls extensively, Time rarely covered other expressions of public opinion. The magazine ran pictures of flag waving crowds in several issues, but such patriotic outbursts were only mentioned in the text in three instances.[72] The first longer article on the conflict reported crowds seeing the task force off with "deep feelings of national pride and a sense of foreboding about an uncertain future"; many wept at first but then cheered.[73] A week before the surrender, Time reported that casualties had made British "excitement, tinged with jingoism," wear off.[74] The issue covering the surrender, finally, had "an euphoric crowd... gathered outside 10 Downing Street, cheering and singing 'Rule Britannia.'"[75] The only time "ordinary" Britons were quoted in Time was after the sinking of the Sheffield: here a despondent man was said to sum up the reaction of most Britons.[76] Time had no coverage of British press reaction with the exception of a photograph of a front page of The Sun in the first issue dealing with the war.[77] The picture was used to illustrate how "enraged and humiliated" Britain was by the Argentine invasion.

Spiegel, on the other hand, primarily used the press as a gauge of the public mood, and the magazine was quite dismayed by what it found.[78] After reporting the flag waving crowd at the departure of the task force in much the same way as Time, Spiegel surveyed press comments and concluded that "a wave of Victorian jingoism swept over the British Isles."[79]

The magazine continued to charge British newspapers with jingoism in the following weeks, but it also made a point of showing dissenting voices, "island[s] of relative common sense in the battle din of the mass press."[80] The German magazine noted the attacks on the Guardian and the BBC by the tabloids and by the Conservatives, and it repeatedly gave extensive accounts of the way The Sun covered the war.[81] Most of the British press had lost its well-known sense of fairness, according to Spiegel, and "never before have the newspapers so diligently prepared an entire nation for fighting" by showing the war as sportsmanlike and beautiful.[82]

Like Time, Spiegel did not, as a rule, interview ordinary people. The two exceptions were the loss of lives on the Sheffield, when the quotations of the two magazines were almost identical, and the departure of the fleet, when a docker promised that the Argentines would get "a beating."[83] Otherwise, it was the press that spoke for the British public as far as Spiegel was concerned.

Maclean's was similar to Time in its general references to the British public. As the danger of war increased, for instance, "Britons" were becoming "weary of the adventure."[84] The Canadian magazine had no interviews with ordinary Britons; the loss of the Sheffield (when both Spiegel and Time quoted dismayed citizens) merited only the general claim that "harrowing [TV] interviews with tear-stained widows of British sailors only added to the public's resolve to 'see it

through.'"[85] Maclean's paid some attention to the press in Britain, noting "screaming" headlines in early May and observing that "the bellicose public mood" was mirrored in the attacks on the BBC.[86] Its view of the British press was far less critical than that of Spiegel, however.

Alone among the four magazines, Profil chose to cover the Falkland War primarily from Argentina. (While its correspondent repeatedly had to explain that he was neither English nor American, he apparently was not harassed by the authorities the way the correspondents of Time and Maclean's were.[87]) As a consequence, coverage of the British home front was rather scanty. Only the first issue dealing with the Falklands had a British focus[88], but the magazine did occasionally run essays in connection with the straight news articles, and these frequently discussed British public reaction to the war.

Like Spiegel, Profil looked at the initial patriotic outburst with some dismay. Its first article on the conflict had the headline "England's Falkland Fever" and noted that

> Suddenly, the newspapers were in mobilization ecstasy... multi-voiced and defiant [they] sang "Rule Britannia, Britannia, Rule the Waves." ...
>
> Suddenly, an epidemic of great words broke out in Great Britain -- with symptoms long presumed dead: nationalistic itching, militaristic loudness, mobilization fever.[89]

In the next few weeks, Profil paid relatively little attention to th British press and public, although it noted the headlines of London tabloids.[90] In essays in two June

issues, the magazine reflected on the way the British press covered the war -- "Is War like Cricket?"[91] -- and the similarities between the tone of the pro-war newspapers and the German press prior to World War II:

> "We have the best soldiers in the world" -- "We understand now again that our nation is one family" ... The language of Mrs. Thatcher and the patriotic press of the oldest democracy in the world has a familiar ring to it.[92]

For Profil and Spiegel, the British press best mirrored public opinion, then, while the two North American magazines were more concerned with poll figures.

ARGENTINA: A BRIEF COMPARISON

Looking at public opinion in Argentina, the four magazines all used man-on-the-street interviews more frequently than in their coverage of Britain. Time showed some consistency by citing the only poll of Argentines available, which none of the other magazines used.[93] The magazine still did not include press comments in its coverage, but interviews with ordinary Argentines were used twice.[94] Maclean's ran one man-in-the-street quote but relied mainly on rallies and demonstrations to convey the mood in Argentina.[95]

Spiegel used interviews more extensively than its North American counterparts,[96] but the German magazine also kept faith in the press as a reflection of public opinion and frequently printed comments by Argentine newspapers.[97]

For reasons discussed above, Profil's coverage of Argentina was more extensive than the other three magazines. The correspondent in Buenos Aires interviewed average citizens as well as politicians; he attended rallies, eavesdropped in coffeehouses, and read newspapers.[98] The result was a picture of the Argentine frame of mind that surpassed the other three magazines.

CONCLUSION

The two ways of presenting public opinion discussed in the introduction were both represented in the coverage of Spiegel, Profil, Maclean's, and Time. The North American magazines used polls, while their European counterparts relied on press comments. This could be attributed to the prevailing European tradition of a partisan press, which makes Profil and Spiegel more accustomed to regard editorial opinion as a reflection of various political viewpoints.

While polls undoubtedly are more representative of the public as a whole, they are less effective in showing why the public has taken a particular stand. In the Falkland conflict, the British public opinion contrasted sharply with the view of the four newsmagazines, and it would seem important for the magazines to explain this discrepancy to their readers. Neither Time nor Maclean's put their poll results into context, however, and Spiegel's disdainful reviews of press comments provided few insights. Only Profil attempted to show what the "new British pride" was founded

on. It was not much different from the nationalism at an international game of soccer, one Profil columnist wrote, when "every Austrian [wears] a patriotic crown":

> National honor... stems not from the stupidity of the people but from passion and yearning, depths where good and evil are mixed up; the abysses of the soul lie miles and miles beneath the brain.[99]

Culturally and politically, the British are close to the readers of Time, Spiegel, Maclean's, and Profil. The outburst of "jingoism" (a term used by all four magazines) in Britain in the spring of 1982 needed to be explained to Europeans and North Americans accustomed to look on war as undesirable and unpopular. Part of the purpose of news magazines is to provide perspective and interpretation. In the case of the Falklands, this was largely lacking.

Notes

[1]The informing function is stressed in Daniel J. Boorstin, Democracy and Its Discontents(New York: Vintage Books, 1975), p. 20; and William Albig, Modern Public Opinion (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), p. 17; James Bryce, "The Nature of Public Opinion," in Reader in Public Opinion and Mass Communication, ed. by Morris Janowitz and Paul M. Hirsch (3rd ed., New York: Free Press, 1981), p. 8, describes the reflecting function.

[2]Bryce, op. cit.

[3]Albig, p. 376.

[4]John L. Martin, "The Genealogy of Public Opinion Polling," Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science 472(March 1984):12-23, pp. 17; Irving Crespi, "Polls as Journalism," Public Opinion Quarterly 44(1980):462-76, pp. 462-63.

[5]Albert E. Gollin, "Exploring the Liasion Between Polling and the Press," Public Opinion Quarterly 44(Winter 1980):445-62, pp. 447-48

[6]Peter Calvert, The Falklands Crisis: The Rights and the Wrongs (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), p. 90; Keesing's Contemporary Archives 1982, p. 31532.

[7]Keesing's 1982, p. 31533.

[8]Europa Year Book 1984, vol II, p. 1339; '82 Ayer Directory of Publications, p. 672; Meyers Enzyklopedisches Lexikon (Mannheim: Lexikon Verlag, 1978); Europa Year Book 1984, vol. I, p. 308.

[9]For the philosophy of Time, see Theodore Peterson, Magazines in the Twentieth Century (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1958), pp. 298-99; George Kurian, World Press Encyclopedia (New York: Facts on File, 1982), p. 377; Profil, May 10, p. 47; Paul Rutherford, The Making of the Canadian Media (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978), p. 108.

[10]Broder Carstensen, Spiegel Worter, Spiegel Worte (Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1971), pp. 21-33; Kurian, p. 128; Rutherford, p. 88.

[11]Time and Maclean's: April 19, May 10, May 17, May 31; Spiegel: April 12, May 3, May 10, May 24.

[12]June 7, June 28; "ears": April 26, May 24.

[13]Spiegel: April 26, May 17, June 7; Mclean's: April 26, May 3, May 24, June 7:

[14]Profil, April 19, May 3, May 10.

[15]Facts on File 42(1982), nos. 2160-2171.

[16]See Johan Galtung and Marie Ruge, "The Structure of Foreign News," Journal of Peace Research 1(1965):64-90; for the concept of elite nations.

[17]Day-by-day chronologies of the war are found in Martin Honeywell and Jenny Pearce, Falklands/Malvinas: Whose Crisis? (London: Latin American Bureau, 1982), and in Bruce Watson and Peter Dunn, eds.,Military Lessons of the Falkland War: Views from the United States (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984).

[18]Anthony Barnett, "Iron Britannia," New Left Review 34(July/August 1982), p. 92.

[19]Index to International Public Opinion, 1981-82 (Greenwood, Conn.: Greenwood Press), p. 158; Index 1982-83, p. 174; The Economist, April 17, 1982, p. 21; April 24, p. 27; May 8, p. 25; May 29, p. 22; June 26, p. 26; the polls were commissioned by the magazine and are comprehensively presented in the issues cited here; for the role of polls in Britain, see Robert M. Worcester, "Pollsters, the Press, and Political Polling in Britain," Public Opinion Quarterly 44(Winter 1980):548-67.

[20]The Economist, June 26, 1982, p. 64; May 1, 1982, p. 12.

[21]Index 1981-82, pp 196-97.

[22]Ibid., p. 317; Index to International Public Opinion 1982-83, p. 314.

[23]Index 1981-82, pp. 196-97

[24]Index 1982-83, p. 219; also, p. 332.

[25]Ibid.

[26]John Laffin, Fight for the Falklands! Why and How Britain and Argentina Went to War: From Invasion to Surrender (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982), pp. 27, 32, 174; Calvert, p. 87; Anthony Lejeune, "Colonel Blimp's Day," National Review, July 23, 1982; Yvonne Roberts and Jeremy Seabrook, "The Patriots of Pompey," New Society, June 3, 1982, pp. 379-81.

[27]Laffin, pp. 156-57, 159; Honeywell and Pearce, p. 109; Max Hastings and Simon Jenkins, The Battle for the Falklands (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1983), p. 333; Robert Harris, Gotcha! The Media, the Government, and the Falklands Crisis (London: Faber & Faber, 1983), pp. 13-14, 44-50.

[28]Harris, pp. 50-51.

[29]In Honeywell and Pearce, pp. 121-22.

[30]Harris, pp. 43-44, 50.

[31] Liv Hegna, "Om Falklandskrigen og Medieaspektet," Internasjonal Politikk, 3/1983, pp. 345-57, p. 348.

[32] Harris, pp. 73-86.

[33] Harris, pp. 54-55; The Economist, May 29, p. 22.

[34] World Press Review, May 1982, p. 18; June, 1982, pp. 16, 18, 20; The Economist, April 10, 1982, p. 26.

[35] The Economist, April 10, p. 11.

[36] Spiegel, April 12, pp 136, 138.

[37] Ibid., p. 152.

[38] Ibid., May 24, p.. 127.

[39] Ibid., April 12, pp. 136, 138.

[40] Ibid., May 24, p. 129; this was reflected in West German public opinion, see Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann and Edgar Piel, eds., Allensbacher Jahrbuch Der Demoskopie, 1978-1983, Band VIII (Munich: K.G. Sahr, 1983), p. 665

[41] Ibid., June 21, p. 117.

[42] Profil, April 26, p. 38.

[43] Ibid.,May 10, p. 47.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid., May 17, p. 41.

[46] Ibid., May 3, p. 35.

[47] Ibid., May 17, p. 41.

[48] Ibid., June 21, pp. 40-41.

[49] Time, April 19, pp. 27, 32, 19, 31.

[50] Ibid., p. 27

[51] Ibid., May 3, p. 14

[52] Ibid., May 17, p. 15

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid., May 31, p. 36.

[55]Ibid., June 7, pp. 38-39; June 14, pp. 34-36.

[56]Maclean's, April 19, pp. 32, 33.

[57]Ibid., April 12, p. 30.

[58]Ibid., April 12, p. 31.

[59]Ibid., May 3, p. 23.

[60]Ibid., May 10, p. 42.

[61]Ibid., May 31, p. 26.

[62]Ibid., June 28, p, 22.

[63]Time, April 19, p. 29; April 26, p. 26; May 10, p. 24; May 17, p. 18; May 31, p. 34; June 14; p. 36; June 28, pp. 26-27.

[64]Time, June 14, op. cit; also, May 10, op. cit; May 17, op. cit.; May 31, op. cit.; June 28, op. cit.

[65]Ibid., April 19, op. cit.; April 26, op. cit.

[66]Ibid., May 10, op. cit; May 17, op. cit.

[67]Ibid., May 31, op. cit.; June 14, op. cit.; June 28, op. cit.

[68]Maclean's, April 26, p. 39; May 3, p. 22; May 17, p. 21; May 24, p. 30; May 31, p. 28; June 14, p. 24; June 28, p. 22.

[69]Ibid., May 17, op. cit.; June 14, op. cit.

[70]Ibid., April 26, op. cit.; May 3, op. cit.; May 24, op. cit.; May 31, op. cit.

[71]Spiegel, April 12, p. 139; May 3, p. 128; June 7, p. 120; April 26, p. 128.

[72]Time, April 19, p. 31; May 17, p. 12; May 24, p. 42; June 21, p. 43; June 28, p. 27.

[73]Ibid., April 19, p. 26.

[74]Ibid., June 7, p. 34.

[75]Ibid., June 28, p. 24.

[76]Ibid., May 17, p. 18.

[77]Ibid., April 12, p. 42.

[78]Spiegel, May 3, p. 128; May 10, pp. 134-37; May 24, p. 126-28; June 7, p. 122.

[79]Ibid., April 12, p. 138.

[80]Ibid., April 26, p. 129; May 3, p. 128; May 10, pp. 134-37; May 24, p. 130.

[81]Ibid., May 10, pp. 134-37; May 24, p. 126.

[82]Ibid., May 3, p. 123: May 10, p. 135.

[83]Ibid., May 10, p. 129; April 12, p. 134.

[84]Maclean's April 26, p. 39; also: April 19, p. 30; May 17, p. 14; June 21, p. 14.

[85]Ibid., May 17, p. 21.

[86]Ibid., May 3, p. 22; June 21, p. 14.

[87]Profil, May 3, pp. 34-35; Time, May 17, p. 31; Maclean's, May 17, p. 3.

[88]Profil, April 13, p. 43.

[89]Ibid., April 13, p. 43.

[90]Ibid, May 24, p. 39.

[91]Ibid., June 13, p. 30.

[92]Ibid., June 1, p. 38.

[93]Time, May 17, p. 29; The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1982 (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc.), pp. 99-100.

[94]Ibid., April 12, p. 30; June 7, p. 36.

[95]Maclean's, April 19, p. 36 (interview); April 26, p. 38; June 21, p. 15; June 28, p. 22 (rallies).

[96]Spiegel, May 3, p. 132; May 10, p. 137; June 14, p. 124.

[97]Ibid., June 7, p. 116; May 10, p. 137; May 3, p. 129.

[98]Profil, April 19, p. 31; May 3, p. 35 (citizen interviews); April 19, pp. 31, 32; April 26, p. 38 (politicians); May 3, p. 35 (rallies); April 26, p. 42; May 17, p. 38, May 24, p. 39; June 1, p. 35 (press reviews).

[99]Ibid., June 1, p. 38.